1	DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669		
	City Attorney		
2	KRISTEN A. JENSEN, State Bar #130196 THOMAS S. LAKRITZ, State Bar #161234 CHRISTINE VAN AKEN, State Bar #241755 Deputy City Attorneys		
3			
4	City Hall, Room 234 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place		
5	San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 554-4615 Facsimile: (415) 554-4757 E-Mail: kristen.jensen@sfgov.org		
6			
7	E-Wall. Kristen.jensen@sigov.org		
8	Attorneys for Defendant	_	
9	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (Including SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING		
10	INSPECTION, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDIN INSPECTION COMMISSION, and		
11	SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMI	ENT)	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
14	OAKLAND DIVISION		
15	REGAN CARROLL TRUST, Regan Case No. C-07-2577 SBA		
16	Carroll, Trustee,	CITY'S MOT	ION TO DISMISS FOR
17	Plaintiff,	LACK OF JU	RISDICTION AND STATE A CLAIM AND,
18	VS.		ERNATIVE, FOR
19	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN		l); 12(B)(6); 56]
	FRANCISCO, SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING	Hearing Date:	December 11, 2007
20	INSPECTION, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING INSPECTION	Time: Place:	1:00 p.m. Courtroom 3, 3 rd Floor
21	COMMISSION, and SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT,	Trial Date:	TBA
22	Defendants.		
23			
24		i	
25	Defendant City and County of San Francisco (sued herein as the City and County of San		
26	Francisco, San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, San Francisco Building Inspection		
27	Commission, and San Francisco Planning Department; collectively "City") moves the court to		
28	dismiss the action pursuant to FRCP 12(b)1), 12 CITY'S MOTION TO DISMISS CASE NO. C-07-2577 SBA	2 (b)(6) or, in the al	ternative, for summary judgment n:\land\li2007\080285\00442554.doc

pursuant to FRCP 56. This motion is made on the grounds that Plaintiff's complaint fails to state a claim for which relief can be granted, and some or all of the claims set forth in the complaint are not ripe for review.

Specifically, the complaint fails to state a claim for relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 in that Plaintiff has failed to allege facts establishing (1) acts by the defendants (2) under color of state law (3) depriv[ed][it] of federal rights, privileges or immunities [and] (4) caus[ed][it] damage. Moreover, the court must apply the highly deferential "rational basis" standard of review to Plaintiff's claims. Because the proposed project did not comply with existing local law at the time Plaintiff sought its issuance, the City's refusal to issue the requested permit was rationally based.

Plaintiff's claims are also barred on the basis of *res judicata* and collateral estoppel, because Plaintiff failed to seek state judicial relief from the administrative decisions it now challenges, and those determinations must now be accorded preclusive effect. In addition, Plaintiff's §1983 claims are barred by the statute of limitations, since those claims are premised on alleged actions by the City that Plaintiff claims occurred prior to June, 2001.

Alternatively, the complaint sets forth claims which are not ripe for review, since the Complaint does not allege that the City has taken final action with respect to Plaintiff's building permit application. In fact, at Plaintiff's request, the City's Board of Appeals continued the hearing of Plaintiff's claims relating to the City's denial of a building permit for one year, and has taken no further action thereon.

The motion to dismiss is made based on this Motion, the Notice of Motion and the Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed in this action, the City's request for judicial notice in support of the motion, the pleadings and papers on file with this Court, and such other matters as may be presented to the Court at the time of hearing.

Dated: October 10, 2007

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney
KRISTEN A. JENSEN
THOMAS S. LAKRITZ
CHRISTINE VAN AKEN
Deputy City Attorneys

KRISTEN A. JENSEN

Attorneys for Defendant CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CITY'S MOTION TO DISMISS CASE NO. C-07-2577 SBA